

CASE NO.: 50T5561.01
Serial No.: 10/666,724
March 13, 2010
Page 8

PATENT
Filed: September 19, 2003

Remarks

Written Description Rejections

Claims 17-19, 22-24, 26, 29, and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for lacking written description. The rejections are overcome by the amendments advanced herein and will not be further addressed.

Obviousness Rejections

- a. Independent Claims 1 and 24 and dependent Claims 2, 6 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, USPP 2003/0117587 in view of Chang, USPP 2002/0183003 and further in view of Nesic, USPN 6,593,895 and Koyama, USPP 2002/0159035.
- b. Dependent Claims 4 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Chang, Nesic, Koyama, and Rao, USPN 5,881,074.
- c. Dependent Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Chang, Nesic, Koyama, and Edenson, USPN 7,006,995.
- d. Independent Claims 7, 9, and 31 and dependent Claims 8, 10-12, 16, 32-34, and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Chang, Nesic, and Saints, USPN 6,374,085.
- e. Dependent Claims 14, 36, and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Chang, Nesic, Saints, and Edenson.
- f. Dependent Claims 15, 29, and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Chang, Nesic, Saints, and Koyama.
- g. Dependent Claim 35 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Chang, Nesic, Saints, and Rao.

J168-98.AM44

CASE NO.: 50T5561.01
Serial No.: 10/666,724
March 13, 2010
Page 9

PATENT
Filed: September 19, 2003

Obviousness Rejections

Independent Claims 1, 7, and 9

As suggested by the examiner, these claims now recite that player control signals are multiplexed with multimedia data on the link, which Applicant believes it was agreed distinguishes over the references.

Independent Claims 17 and 31

Although not discussed in the telephone call, Applicant notes that Claim 31 has been rejected on the basis of Saints' power control signals, but Claim 31 does not recite power control. Instead, Claim 31 recites control signals that are useful for establishing a source *antenna beam form control*, a concept not addressed, to the best of Applicant's belief, in the relied-upon references. Claim 31 appears to be patentable.

Likewise, Claim 17, which recites that capability signals are sent from the receiver to the means for wirelessly transmitting to cause the means for wirelessly transmitting to adjust a *directivity of an antenna beam transmitted by the means for wirelessly transmitting* appears to be patentable.

1168-98.AM4

From:Rogitz & Assoc.

619 338 8078

03/13/2010 08:39

#116 P.010/010

CASE NO.: 50T5561.01
Serial No.: 10/666,724
March 13, 2010
Page 10

PATENT
Filed: September 19, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

/John L. Rogitz/

John L. Rogitz
Registration No. 33,549
Attorney of Record
750 B Street, Suite 3120
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1168-98.AM4